

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	Fi	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/672,773	(09/26/2003	Richard Sita	MATP-39902US1	9714
23122	7590	07/14/2006		EXAMINER	
RATNERF	RESTIA		TRAN, TRANG U		
P O BOX 98	30				
VALLEY FORGE, PA 19482-0980				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	ŕ			2622	

DATE MAILED: 07/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	10/672,773	SITA, RICHARD	SITA, RICHARD				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Trang U. Tran	2622					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	This action is non-final. owance except for formal mat		merits is				
Disposition of Claims							
4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examond The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objected to by the Claim(s) is/are is/are: a) The oath or declaration is objected to by the cannot be considered to a specification of the cannot be cann	ndrawn from consideration. and/or election requirement. miner. accepted or b) objected to the drawing(s) be held in abeya orrection is required if the drawing.	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 CF					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/S Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/26/2003.	Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) b(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO 	-152)				

Art Unit: 2622

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 1-2, 4-16 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipate by Le Gall et al (US Patent No. 4,897,799).

In considering claim 1, Le Gall et al discloses all the claimed subject matter, note 1) the claimed sensing information provided by a display device having a display format, the sensed information being indicative of the display format of the display device is met by the original device 12 which send a raster display (native format) to the receiving device 14 (Figs. 1 and 2, col. 3, lines 18-42), and 2) the claimed determining the display format of the display device responsive to the sensed information is met by the raster display which can be characterized by pixel aspect ratio, the resolution, the color mode, the number of bits per pixel (Figs. 1 and 2, col. 3, line 27 to col. 4, line 30).

In considering claim 2, the claimed wherein the display device includes a register containing information indicative of the display format and wherein the sensing step comprises at least the step of: reading the register to obtain the information indicative of the display format is met by the formatting box 14 which processes a header 20 in the form of Fig. 2 (col. 3, line 27 to col. 4, line 30).

Art Unit: 2622

In considering claim 4, the claimed wherein the register includes an aspect ratio and resolution of the display device and wherein the determining step comprises at least the step of: determining the display format for the display device based on the aspect ratio and resolution read from the register is met by the raster display which can be characterized by pixel aspect ratio, the resolution, the color mode, the number of bits per pixel (Figs. 1 and 2, col. 3, line 27 to col. 4, line 30).

In considering claim 5, the claimed wherein the reading step comprises at least the step of: reading the register over at least one video signal line coupled to the display device, the at least one video signal line configured as a two-way data path is met by the conversion of one raster type of video RGB format to another (Fig. 4, col. 6, lines 15-42).

Claims 6-7 are rejected for the same reason as discussed in claims 1-2, respectively.

Claim 9 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 4.

Claim 10 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 4.

Claim 11 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 4.

Claim 12 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 5.

In considering claim 13, Le Gall et al discloses all the claimed subject matter, note 1) the claimed a video monitor including: a display device is met by the original device 12 (display device) which send a raster display (native format) to the receiving device 14 (Figs. 1 and 2, col. 3, lines 18-42), 2) the claimed a digital register coupled to the display device, the digital register including data indicative of at least one

Art Unit: 2622

characteristic of the display device is met by the formatting box 14 which processes a header 20 in the form of Fig. 2 (col. 3, line 27 to col. 4, line 30), and 3) the claimed a data path coupled to the digital register to provide the data indicative of the at least one characteristic of the display device to an output port is met by the data path of conversion unit 10 (Fig. 4, col. 6, lines 15-42).

In considering claim 14, the claimed wherein the data path is a video signal path configured as a two-way data path is met by the data path of conversion unit 10 which is a two-way path (Fig. 4, col. 6, lines 15-42).

Claim 15 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 4.

Claim 16 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 4.

In considering claim 18, discloses all the claimed subject matter, note 1) the claimed a video display system including: a video display having a register including data indicative of at least one characteristic of the video display device is met by the original device 12 (display device) which send a raster display (native format) to the receiving device 14 (Figs. 1 and 2, col. 3, lines 18-42), and 2) the claimed a decoder configured to read the data in the register of the video display and determine the at least one characteristic of the video display from the data is met by the conversion unit which firs decodes the coded raster format, and then do the conversion proceeds (Fig. 4, col. 6, lines 15-42).

Claim 19 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 4.

Claim 20 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 4.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Page 5

Application/Control Number: 10/672,773

Art Unit: 2622

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 3 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Le Gall et al (US Patent No. 4,897,799).

In considering claim 3, Le Gall et al disclose all the limitations of the instant invention as discussed in claims 1 and 2 above, except for providing the claimed wherein the register includes a manufacturer and model number of the display device and wherein the determining step comprises at least the step of: determining the display format for the display device based on the manufacturer and model number read from the register. The capability of using the register includes a manufacturer and model number of the display device is old and well known in the art. Therefore, the Official Notice is taken. It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the old and well known using of the register includes a manufacturer and model number of the display device into Le Gall et al's system in order to adjust display parameters for the display monitor based on the manufacturer and model number read from the register of the display device.

Claim 17 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 3.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2622

Reddy (US Patent No. 6,078,361) discloses video adapter circuit for conversion of an analog video signal to a digital display image.

Nohara (US Patent No. 5,572,259) discloses method of changing personal computer monitor output for use by a general purpose video display.

Thoma, III (US Patent No. 5,038,301) discloses method and apparatus for multimonitor adaptation circuit.

Ellis, Jr. et al (US Patent No. 4,562,450) disclose data management for plasma display.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Trang U. Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-7358. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 5:30 PM, Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David L. Ometz can be reached on (571) 272-7593. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2622

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TT June 21, 2006

Trang U. Tran Examiner Art Unit 2622